

Recent price information indicates that the grower price for the 1998–99 season should average \$800 per salable ton of dried prunes. Based on estimated shipments of 161,500 salable tons, the estimated assessment revenue for the 1998–99 crop year is expected to be less than 1 percent of the total expected grower revenue.

This action increases the assessment obligation imposed on handlers. While assessments impose some additional costs on handlers, the costs are minimal and uniform on all handlers. Some of the additional costs may be passed on to producers. However, these costs are offset by the benefits derived by the operation of the marketing order. In addition, the Committee's meeting was widely publicized throughout the California dried prune industry, and all interested persons were invited to attend the meeting and participate in Committee deliberations on all issues. Like all Committee meetings, the June 25, 1998, meeting was a public meeting and all entities, both large and small, were able to express views on this issue.

This rule imposes no additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements on either small or large California dried prune handlers. As with all Federal marketing order programs, reports and forms are periodically reviewed to reduce information requirements and duplication by industry and public sector agencies.

The Department has not identified any relevant Federal rules that duplicate, overlap, or conflict with this rule.

A proposed rule concerning this action was published in the **Federal Register** on August 7, 1998 (63 FR 42284). Copies of the proposed rule were also mailed or sent via facsimile to all dried prune handlers. Finally, the proposal was made available through the Internet by the Office of the Federal Register. A 30-day comment period ending September 8, 1998, was provided for interested persons to respond to the proposal. No comments were received.

After consideration of all relevant material presented, including the information and recommendation submitted by the Committee and other available information, it is hereby found that this rule, as hereinafter set forth, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, it also found and determined that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this rule until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** because the 1998–99 crop year began on August 1, 1998, and the marketing order requires

that the rate of assessment for each crop year apply to all assessable dried prunes handled during such year. Moreover, the Committee needs to have sufficient funds to pay its expenses which are incurred on a continuous basis. Further, handlers are aware of this rule which was recommended at a public meeting. Also, a 30-day comment period was provided for in the proposed rule, and no comments were received.

#### List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 993

Marketing agreements, Plums, Prunes, Reporting and Recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR part 993 is amended as follows:

#### PART 993—DRIED PRUNES PRODUCED IN CALIFORNIA

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR part 993 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

2. Section 993.347 is revised to read as follows:

##### § 993.347 Assessment rate.

On and after August 1, 1998, an assessment rate of \$2.16 per ton is established for California dried prunes.

Dated: September 25, 1998.

**Robert C. Keeney,**

*Deputy Administrator, Fruit and Vegetable Programs.*

[FR Doc. 98–26479 Filed 10–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

##### Federal Aviation Administration

##### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–ANE–33–AD; Amendment 39–10762; AD 98–19–21]

RIN 2120–AA64

##### Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce, plc RB211 Trent 800 Series Turbofan Engines; Correction

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule; request for comments; correction.

**SUMMARY:** This document makes a correction to Airworthiness Directive (AD) 98–ANE–33–AD; Amendment 39–10762 that is applicable to Rolls-Royce, plc RB211 Trent 800 series turbofan engines that was published in the **Federal Register** on September 22, 1998 (63 FR 50484–50485). The AD number “AD 98–18–21” is incorrect. The correct

AD number is “AD 98–19–21”. In all other respects, the original document remains the same.

**DATES:** Effective October 7, 1998.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A final rule airworthiness directive applicable to Rolls-Royce, plc RB211 Trent 800 series turbofan engines was published in the **Federal Register** on September 22, 1998 (63 FR 50484). The published AD number is incorrect and the following corrections are needed:

On page 50484, in the first column, in the fifth line of the heading, “AD 98–18–21” is corrected to read “AD 98–19–21”.

On page 50485, in the second column, sixth line from the top of the column, “98–18–21” is corrected to read “98–19–21”.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on September 24, 1998.

**Jay J. Pardee,**

*Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 98–26355 Filed 10–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

##### Federal Aviation Administration

##### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–NM–287–AD; Amendment 39–10816; AD 98–21–08]

RIN 2120–AA64

##### Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Saab Model SAAB 2000 series airplanes. This action requires repetitive functional tests (checks) to verify proper operation of the nose wheel steering system (NWSS) limit switch, and replacement of the existing limit switch with a new limit switch, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent combined failure of the limit switch and the feedback shaft in the NWSS servo unit, which could result in uncommanded nose wheel steering deflection and reduced controllability of the airplane on the ground during takeoff or landing.